

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the reflectance of the planar light source unit is defined in a non-emission state in which said planar light source is turned off. Support for this recitation is found in the original application, in particular on page 5, lines 9-10. Claim 1 has also be amended to clarify the presentation.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. It is alleged in the Office Action that the reflectance of 50 to 90% is not enabled because the specification does not disclose how to achieve this reflectance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the specification provides sufficient explanations and illustrations to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtain a light source having a reflectance of 50 to 90%. Reference is made in particular to paragraph [0009] starting on page 5, line 14, which explain the rationale for determining the reflectance range according to the present invention, and to paragraphs [0014] starting on page 8, line 12 and [0015] starting on page 9, line 7, which describe various manners of adjusting the reflectance to achieve the features of the present invention. The adjustments proposed in these paragraphs can be performed by a person of ordinary skill in the art on the basis of the manipulations disclosed in these paragraphs.

Further, the Examples and Comparative Examples illustrate such adjustments as well as differences between the luminance of a light source associated with a reflective polarizer, as used in the present invention, and the measured luminance of the light source in the absence of a reflective polarizer (see Reference Examples, in particular the Table starting on page 20, line 1). Therefore, it is submitted that the invention as presently claimed is sufficiently enabled in the

original specification.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for lack of clarity. It is alleged in the Office Action that it is unclear whether the reflection is that of emitted light, internally reflected light, or total exiting light.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. The specification makes clear that the reflectance as defined in the present invention is that of external light impinging on the light source unit in a non-emission state in which said planar light source is turned off, as explained on page 5, lines 9-10. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this point. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2001-228310 (Honda), and claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Honda in view of US 6,016,177 to Motomura (Motomura).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Honda is a Japanese patent application publication, and accordingly, Honda has an effective date on August 24, 2001, its publication date. Thus, Honda is not a reference against the present application which claims priority of Japanese patent application No. 2001-103999 filed on April 3, 2001 (JP'999). A certified English translation of JP'999 is submitted with this response. The certified translation evidences that the disclosure in JP'999 was substantially coextensive with the disclosure in the present application. Specifically, differences between the texts are limited to the order of paragraphs in the description, the title, a slightly different wording in paragraph [0007], the claim dependencies, and the abstract. As a result of the perfected claim for priority of JP'999, Honda is

removed as a reference against the presently claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,373

**Atty. Docket No. 020533**

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 822-1100  
Fax: (202) 822-1111  
Customer No.: 38834  
NES:rep

Encls.:      Petition for Two-Month Extension of Time  
              Certified English Translation of Priority Document